Social Progress

For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ. . . . If one member suffers, all suffer together; if one member is honored, all rejoice together.

(I Cor. 12: 12, 26)

Selected Resources on Race Relations

JANUARY 1956

Vol. XLVI, No. 5

Social Progress

Published by the Department of Social Education and Action of the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., to provide a forum for the Church on subjects of social concern for Christians. It includes program resources, legislative developments, and guides to worship, study, and action for leaders of social action groups in local churches, presbyteries, synods, presbyterial and synodical societies. Articles represent the opinions of the authors—not the official policy of the Department of Social Education and Action or of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

CONTENTS : January, 1956

From This Vantage Point 3

Sections

Participants in the Struggle 4

Prejudice—Some Causes and Cures 9

Legislation—One Approach 16

The Housed Who Are Homeless 21

Scripture Speaks to Us 24

Aye, But . . . It Does Move 28

The Announcer ..... *Back cover*

Department of Social Education and Action: Clifford Earle, Margaret E. Kuhn, H. B. Sissel, Gayraud Wilmore; Helen H. Harder (Editorial Assistant), Helen Lineweaver (Director of Washington Office). Editorial correspondence should be addressed to Clifford Earle, Secretary and Editor.

Counseling Committee on Social Education and Action: Joseph J. Copeland, Mrs. Edward Fisher, Arthur W. Mielke, Henry Lee Willet, Frank T. Wilson, Chairman, Paul S. Wright; Mrs. Roland P. Beattie, Richard Pacini, Shelby Rooks; Walter H. Eastwood, John A. Mackay; Emery Bacon, Mrs. Werner J. Blanchard, C. Elwood Boulware, Herbert N. Brockway, William Adams Brown, Jr., Burton Fowler, Paul K. Justus, Paul Lehmann, Franc L. McCluer, Mrs. Harold R. Tolliver, Edmund S. Wolfe, and Willem F. Zuurdeeg.

Published monthly, except August, by the Department of Social Education and Action of the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, at 1009 Sloan St., Crawfordsville, Indiana. Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Crawfordsville, Indiana, under the act of March 3, 1879.

Editorial and Executive office, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pa.

Subscriptions, $1.00 a year; three years for $2.50. Single copy, 15 cents. Group rates on request.

Send subscriptions to 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pa.

Copyright, 1955, by the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

From This Vantage Point...

A BROADER PERSPECTIVE

AT LEAST a score of people have written this issue of SOCIAL PROGRESS. Most of them are specialists in one way or another; some are distinguished specialists. In anticipation of Brotherhood Week in February, it is devoted in its entirety to what is called, with mixed emotional connotations, "the race problem."

This issue consists of excerpts from various sources—books, magazines, newspapers, pamphlets—all of them dealing with at least one aspect of race relations. It is intended to be a very modest source book for speakers, discussion leaders, and tacticians whose duties and time schedules do not permit them to be "experts" in the field of race relations or to read as widely as they would like. We are hopeful that some who read this will have their appetites whetted and will be motivated to procure of the resources used.

It will not solve "the problem," nor will it, if handed to the deeply prejudiced person, "convert" him. It will not speak directly and immediately to the church that seeks to become inclusive (January, 1955, SOCIAL PROGRESS does that, we think). Here are some of the things it *may* do:

- Provide motivation for further study for persons mildly interested, but not committed.
- Suggest new perspectives from which to view and discuss possible causes, symptoms, and treatment of prejudice and discrimination in groups and individuals.
- Warn against tempting generalizations and simplifications.
- Answer some fallacies based on faulty reasoning or unfounded assumptions if they involve no great emotional stake.

It is appropriate that this issue begin and end with the words of Walter White, who spent all his adult life in the struggle for racial justice and who died suddenly in March of 1955.

Deep appreciation is expressed to the publishers named herein for permission to quote so extensively from their publications.

—The SEA Staff

PARTICIPANTS in the Struggle

What does it mean to be a Negro in the United States? a white participant in the struggle for justice? a white dissident?

I AM a Negro. My skin is white, my eyes are blue, my hair is blond. The traits of my race are nowhere visible upon me. Not long ago I stood one morning on a subway platform in Harlem. As the train came in I stepped back for safety. My heel came down upon the toe of the man behind me. I turned to apologize to him. He was a Negro, and his face as he stared at me was hard and full of the piled-up bitterness of a thousand lynchings and a million nights in shacks and tenements and "nigger towns." "Why don't you look where you're going?" he said sullenly. "You white folks are always trampling on colored people." Just then one of my friends came up and asked how the fight had gone in Washington—there was a filibuster against legislation for a permanent Fair Employment Practices Committee. The Negro on whose toes I had stepped listened, then spoke to me penitently:

"Are you Walter White of the NAACP? I'm sorry I spoke to you that way. I thought you were white."

I am not white. There is nothing within my mind and heart which tempts me to think I am. Yet I realize acutely that the only characteristic which matters to either the white or the colored race—the appearance of whiteness—is mine. There is magic in a white skin; there is tragedy, loneliness, exile in a black skin. Why then do I insist that I am a Negro? . . .

Boyhood in Atlanta

The vanguard of the mob . . . appeared. A voice which we recognized as that of the son of the grocer with whom we had traded for many years yelled, "That's where that nigger mail carrier lives! Let's burn it down! It's too nice for a nigger to live in!" In the eerie light Father turned his drawn face toward me. In a voice as quiet as though he were asking me to pass him the sugar at the breakfast table, he said, "Son, don't shoot until the first man puts his foot on the lawn and then—don't you miss!"

In the flickering light the mob swayed, paused, and began to flow toward us. In that instant there opened up within me a great awareness; I knew then who I was. I was a Negro, a human being with an invisible pigmentation which marked me a person to be hunted, hanged, abused, discriminated against, kept in poverty and ignorance, in order that those whose skin was white would have readily at hand a proof of their superiority, a proof patent and inclusive, accessible to the moron and the idiot as well as to the wise man and the genius. No matter how low a white man fell, he could always hold fast to the smug conviction that he was superior to two thirds of the world's population, for those two thirds were not white.

—*From* A Man Called White, *by Walter White. The Viking Press, 1948. Used by permission.*

"A Senseless, Illogical Pattern"

There is no respite for minority people from their frustration and agony of soul. As long as any one of their number is hated, despised, persecuted, denied opportunities, rights and privileges, lynched, segregated and caricatured, all of their number must inevitably bear the stigma in part. Station, degree of culture, profession, education and religion offer very little protection or defense to an out-group. Difficulties may be lessened somewhat and blows turned aside, but the vulnerability remains. . . . It is almost impossible for even intelligent Negroes to discuss anything within the scope of human knowledge without turning to the question of race prejudice within a very few minutes after the conversation has begun.

It is the cruel, senseless and illogical pattern of prejudice and segregation that makes my existence almost unbearable at times. In one town you can enter a streetcar through the front door, but should you leave it by the same door you can be arrested. In the same town you can browse in a public bookstore on the main street but you cannot go to the public library. In one city you must stand in separate lines while waiting for a bus, but you may mix with white people in a crowded public market. There is no segregation on Northern railroads, although some stewards will try to steer you to the end tables of the diner and ticket sellers of Pullman accommodations often identify Negroes to the reservation clerk by adding the word "special" which carries with it the least desirable space. In one railroad station in a Southern city you may use the white waiting room but must buy tickets at separate windows; in the same city at another station you enter separate doors but buy tickets at the same windows. . . .

The paradoxical nature of the problem robs me not only of my patience but sometimes threatens to rob me of my hope. If I could only know what to expect, where prejudice will strike next and from whom it will come, at least I could prepare to fend it off without falling victim to hypersensitivity. One always knows his course of action once the enemy has shown his face. But when it shows

itself when least expected, or is subtly exhibited by people who by all odds should know better, it becomes exceedingly difficult to react normally to most situations for fear of being caught off guard. This leaves the Negro the hard choice between bitterness and belligerence or more likely reticence and overcaution created by fear and not infrequently self-hatred. Our bewilderment is often more genuine than we ourselves think it, and surely more real than most white people can ever know. It is no doubt this continual emotional upheaval which causes [so many] Negroes to be afflicted with hypertensive heart disease.

—*From* Road Without Turning. *Copyright, 1950, by Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, Inc., publishers.*

•

I would have to remember to wear a tie on the bus from Nashville to McMinnville. In that area, a Negro fares better if he looks educated and willing to demand the few rights he possesses. I would have to remember *not* to wear a tie in several small towns in Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Louisiana, or anywhere in the Deep South. A Negro can get killed in those areas for "dressing and acting like white folks." Americans who doubt this will have forgotten the name of Robert Mallard, an insurance salesman who was lynched at Lyons, Georgia, in 1948.

—*Reprinted from* South of Freedom, *by Carl T. Rowan, by permission of the publisher, Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. Copyright, 1952, by Carl T. Rowan.*

"It's Time They Killed a White Judge"

Just before one P.M., the sacred dining hour in Charleston, my taxi pulled up in front of the glistening gray-white Colonial home. I looked at the quaint fan-window over the door, which no white Charlestonian had walked through since 1947, when Judge Waring issued the now-famous ruling that Negroes must be allowed to vote in South Carolina's previously all-white primary. One of the Federal agents who guarded the Judge constantly sat in a coupé in front of the house. . . .

Judge Waring, former captain of the elite Charleston Light Dragoons, scion of eight generations of Charleston aristocracy and son of a Confederate veteran, . . . had issued a challenge that incensed the South. In his 1947 decision he declared: "It is time for South Carolina to rejoin the Union. It is time to fall in step with the other states and to adopt the American way of conducting elections." . . .

South Carolinians fumed, but not one violated his order. Thirty-five thousand Negroes voted for the first time in their lives. From that day, in the tiniest pool hall and at the most remote country crossroad in the state, J. Waties Waring was known as "the man who let the nigger vote." The name J. Waties Waring became anathema.

In March of 1950, twenty-one thousand persons signed a petition asking that the Judge be impeached. The South Carolina House of Representatives voted ten thousand dollars to finance impeachment proceedings.

It also voted funds to buy the Warings one-way tickets out of the state. No legal basis for impeachment was found, so Judge Waring remained, a pariah in his native land.

Mrs. Waring walked the streets, and white children who hardly had learned to say "mommy" cried "witch." When the Judge walked the streets, friends and acquaintances of more than half a century gazed in store windows or studied cloud formations until he passed. "There was a stone wall of unpleasantness everywhere I went," Judge Waring recalled, so he began to relinquish the social ties of a lifetime. . . .

The loneliness that I had expected seemed nonexistent. "I admit that I miss the shop talk," said Judge Waring. "I miss chatting about this Supreme Court ruling or that, or such and such a case. Socially, I miss no one. I lost small brains and I found larger ones. I have met Southern Negroes and Northerners of both races whom I would never have known except for this." . . .

Then the Judge looked out at the Federal guard, himself the subject of much verbal abuse by whites, who called him "the lover of the nigger-lovers." Judge Waring, whose green-ish eyes continued to shed tears, rubbed his fingers through the gray-golden hair at his temples and pointed at the guard. "I didn't ask for him. He follows me everywhere. It's a nuisance. Perhaps there could be nothing better than that the white-supremacists should kill me."

I gave the Judge a surprised, say-that-again look.

"No, I'm not foolish," he went on, "I don't want to die. But it is time some white people died to wake up America. They kill Negroes like flies and, as a white Georgian put it after a lynching in Irwinton: 'It's just another nigger. It didn't stop a checker game.' It's *time* they killed a white Federal judge. Let the people of the world see how insane this thing is, then perhaps it will wake up Americans."

I had expected to find hatred; but the Warings have resorted to laughter instead. Laughter at incidents such as the time lightning struck a house next to the Warings' summer cottage on an island near Charleston. The owner, who hated the Judge bitterly, surveyed the damage and put up a sign: "Dear God, *he* lives next door."

—*Ibid.*

Voice of the People

Spartanburg, S. C.

Editors, The News:

I read People's Platform regularly and have been especially interested since the infamous decision barring segregation in our schools was handed down by the Supreme Court. As a true Southerner, I am deeply gratified to see that the majority of letters received seemed to favor maintenance of our Southern ideals and traditions.

Those few who favor integration have advanced reasons for their attitudes ranging all the way from "Segregation aids the Communists" to "Christianity has no place for segregation."

Regarding the first reason, it seems to me that the Russians can

take more encouragement from those letters upholding integration, than they can derive from those which express the desire to see our way of life continue, inasmuch as this is a confession of lack of courage to fight for our own personal liberties, let alone those of some foreign country that happens to be under Communist domination.

As to the second reason, if Christianity requires that a person forsake the moral training of a lifetime and repudiate the social system under which generations have lived and prospered, then I guess I'll just have to take my chances on finding me a segregated corner of Hell and eternally fry.

James T. Kirby

Charlotte, N. C.

Editors, The News:

I have read with much interest, alarm, and amazement, the thoughts and ideas of the hate-dispensers since the decision of the Supreme Court. And so it is to them, the hate-dispensers, that this letter is directed.

The more I read, the more firmly convinced I am that the words of a great Southern educator are true. Said he:

What has the worshiping of this god, segregation, done to the South? It has stultified the South and kept it down. It has circumscribed, twisted, and warped the South's mind. It has brutalized the heart of the South. It has perpetuated poverty; it has contributed to the South's illiteracy; it has made us cowards; it has made us touchy and sensitive. We are always defending the South, trying to prove that we are no worse than any other people. Defending segregation is our one consuming passion. Segregation is the root of most of the social ills of the South. We are an abnormal people.

The Negro is not ashamed of having been a slave. The great disgrace of slavery lies at the door of those who kept him captive. We are proud of the progress which we have made during ninety years since the emancipation. We are ready for integration and the color of skin has nothing to do with it and the hate-dispensers know it. It is time for them to stop fooling themselves and trying to fool the world. It is time that they rid themselves of that false security of soul obtained because of their peculiar rationalizing with our Heavenly Father regarding their attitude toward the Negro. Are they trying to fool God, too?

We are American citizens and we make no apologies for our claim to first-class citizenship. The blood, sweat, and tears of the American Negro are on every battlefield upon which America has fought for her freedom and the freedom of the world. We are a part of American history, literature, art, religion, and industry. We sing, with pride, all over the world, "The Star-spangled Banner" and "America," for they are the national songs of our country.

I repeat with confidence and conviction: we are ready for integration and we face the future with hope and trust in God, for God and democracy are real to us. After ninety years, are you not ready, also?

Ione Gwendolyn Jones

—From The Charlotte News, *June 7, 1954, and June 11, 1954. Used by permission.*

PREJUDICE . . .

Some Causes and Cures

No one thing causes it; no one treatment cures it; and it has many facets. But it is not a basic element of human nature.

It was easily apparent that parents of the prejudiced youngsters relied heavily upon discipline and strictness in the upbringing of their young. They often appeared anxious for reassurance as to the behavior of their offspring—how did they compare with others, and did they reflect the rigid training they were being given? They made it clear that they did not approve of children "running wild," as so often seemed to them to be the case in the homes of those whom they considered very much poorer or very much richer than themselves. Many had hopes that were almost fantasies of bettering their own status. They spoke of the possibility of a surprise inheritance from a rich and sometimes unknown uncle, of sweepstakes winnings, or some wondrous and unexpected event that might give them the chance they felt they never had. They were anxious that their young achieve the success that had passed them by: they liked to think that their children might become "important," "famous," "a good deal richer than we are." Their chances, according to the parents, seemed to be linked entirely to the possibility that "fate might be good to them" or that luck would be on their side.

The parents of the low prejudiced youngsters, on the other hand, seemed more anxious to discuss the personalities than the behavior of their children. They spoke with enthusiasm of their special interests and particular capacities. They talked of the importance of *guidance* for the young rather than *obedience* from them, and placed far greater emphasis upon encouragement than on condemnation in dealing with their offspring. Much more often than the parents of the more prejudiced children, they described their own goals in life in terms of achieving emotionally satisfying relationships, and being in occupations that were pleasurable as well as interesting. They were anxious for their

children to take pride in their own accomplishments, to learn that individual effort is essential for achievement. They rarely mentioned "fate" as a factor in their own or their children's destiny unless it was to reject it, for they would often suggest that even in these precarious times there were many things a person could do to improve his lot if he were so determined.

And as we might expect, the children directly reflected their heritage. . . .

The prejudiced youngster often suggested that his own was the perfect father: one who saw that his children were well clothed, fed, and housed, who gave them money for things they needed and sometimes for extras, one who could "manage his children" or "keep them in line." The ideal teacher was one who was "strict," who could control her class and "see that the kids did everything they were supposed to do." The perfect boy was tough, a "regular fellow" who could fight in the gang for his rights, but who also did what his elders told him to do. The perfect girl was "ladylike," never a "tomboy"; she was sweet, well-mannered, "never filthy-minded or dirty," and stayed out of the boys' way unless they invited her to join them. The best occupations were well-paying, "good clean work," "something important," "positions with real influence, like a judge or public official." The worst jobs were "the dirty jobs": garbage collecting, street-cleaning, and ditchdigging.

The youngsters low in prejudice, on the other hand, considered the perfect father to be someone who was "kind," "companionable," and "understanding." The ideal teacher was "fair," "sympathetic," "knew her stuff," and had a sense of humor. The perfect boy, like the perfect girl, was likeable, fun-loving, intelligent, and considerate. The best occupations were those that were "interesting," "satisfying," or "challenging." The worst were the "dull" or "routine" jobs, the ones that required no training or aptitude and had "nothing to offer but money."

Blunting the Edges

To blunt the edges of prejudices in those who are no longer children, we must distinguish between what is flexible and what is fixed in the attitudes of adults. For while we are all faithful and even fettered to our earliest teachings, few of us remain unaffected by the circumstances of the hour. By adulthood one's character may be constant, but the circumstances surrounding it are not, and it is these that so often determine our actions. While prejudiced adults have a great deal in common no two are alike even with respect to their hatreds; for as these have a variety of origins they have also many different natures. Some prejudices may be of recent origin and relatively mild and conciliatory; others may be more rooted and therefore more tenacious. Some will surface readily and frequently; while others are cautious and show themselves almost reluctantly. . . .

We would not serenely propose "mixing of all kinds" or "free association" as an unqualified cure for prejudice; for we know that while some association and mixing may help to modify attitudes of those who are educable, the hostile and unedu-

cable will use these experiences as they use every other experience, to prove how ill advised is such association and how justified is their own prejudice. Prolonged association, moreover, must be on an "equal status" basis, otherwise it will intensify rather than dissipate the stereotype. This happens, for example, when Negroes and whites are in constant and close association but the Negroes are always servants and the whites are always their employers.

—*From* The Fears Men Live By, *by Selma Hirsh. Harper & Brothers, 1955. Used by permission.*

But No Simple Matter

The individuals who have the normal, respectable, genteel, and acceptable forms of prejudice . . . cannot be understood simply by classifying them as unstable personalities. They are considered respectable members of society and would understandably be outraged at the spectacle of overt and violent expressions of the racial prejudices of the small number of extreme bigots. If these individuals saw injustices of a nonracial variety perpetrated against other human beings—or even against animals—their concept of their own respectability would be so outraged as to demand vigorous expressions of disapproval. However, studies of racial tensions reveal that these individuals rarely take an active role in discouraging or demanding punishment for the excesses of the bigots. Usually they stand by passively and in effect lend encouragement to the fanatical racists by remaining silent. It does not add to our understanding to explain this type of passive form of racial prejudice in terms of a disturbance of personality.

The college official who tacitly accepts racial and religious quotas for the admission of an individual student to a graduate or professional school; the school superintendent who condones a pattern of gerrymandering of school districts that leads to segregated schools and who closes his eyes to inferior educational standards in the schools attended by underprivileged children; the church official who preaches the virtues of brotherhood while he bows to his congregation's coldness to Negroes or exclusion of them from his church —these people are in general respected members of their community. They are often admired and their opinions sought on important social issues; they may even be active on the boards of interracial and intergroup agencies. Nevertheless they contribute to the entrenchment of racial and religious prejudices by their acceptance of—and at times involvement in—the existing patterns of discrimination. The personality approach to the understanding of this type of passive prejudice is necessarily an oversimplification. . . .

These respectable, nonviolent supporters of the racial status quo . . . have more influence on the developing attitudes of children than the small group of emotionally unstable bigots who openly spout vulgar anti-Semitic and anti-Negro remarks.

—*From* Prejudice and Your Child, *by Kenneth B. Clark. The Beacon Press, 1955. Used by permission.*

Logic Is Not Enough

Logic alone . . . has no effect to speak of on prejudiced behavior. Once a prejudice is established—whether it concerns the eating of glandular cuts of meats or the ethnic origins of neighbors—it will persist despite all pointing out of inconsistencies between the facts and the prejudice. Now, 80 per cent of our people have prejudices of one kind or another. . . . Merely providing the people with direct information or counter-indoctrination is not sufficient to rectify a false perception. Facts alone, no matter how proved or how valid, are not enough to change attitudes already established. . . .

Rarely do a man's ways and beliefs change in isolation. To change ingroup and outgroup antagonisms calls for far more than changing individual attitudes. Attitudes are part of the group's culture rather than isolated units of a personal being. Hence the change must usually be collective. For an individual's beliefs and attitudes are related to and are supported by the group's cultural standards. Every group expects its members to conform to its accepted beliefs, attitudes and standards. Any major deviation by an individual from the group standard produces censure, disapproval and rejection from that group. Hence most prejudices tend to maintain themselves and to resist change unless the standards of the group are changed concurrently. . . .

Membership in a group implies shared beliefs, attitudes, modes of action, and the common resistance to or acceptance of changes in these. One of the first steps in seeking to change such group beliefs, attitudes and modes of action is to take away from the attitude to be changed the environmental support it receives from the wider community. This may call for changing the practices of the home, the school, the community, the factory, or the church.

—From Living Without Hate, *by Alfred J. Marrow. Harper & Brothers, 1951. Used by permission.*

Three Strategies

The difficulties anticipated in the path of the abolition of discrimination are not necessarily realized. . . . Various practices have been used during the initial period of preparation. Some have thought to avoid later trouble by attempting to ascertain public sentiment concerning intended changes as, for example, the hiring of Negro bus drivers where they had not previously been employed. They attempt to gain public consent for their policy. Others simply announce the intended change in policy without asking for public approval. A third group, finally, goes ahead without any prior announcement and presents the public with a *fait accompli.*

Asking consent—On the surface it appears tempting to insure the success of the intended action by gaining public consent, sounding out how people in general feel about one's plan to introduce minority members in new settings. But we know that prejudiced individuals can be found almost everywhere. . . .

In using opinion polls to predict future behavior we assume, of course, that the questions asked of

the public were unbiased, which can by no means be always taken for granted. The Washington Transit Company, contemplating the wisdom of introducing Negro bus and street car conductors, asked a cross section of the public:

1. Will present operators walk out when Negro operators are employed?
2. Will present operators resort to acts of violence if Negro operators are employed?

The suggestive influence of these questions is obvious. But even where we succeed in asking fair questions, prejudiced individuals anticipate the consequences of minority advancement not in terms of the reality of the situation, but in terms of their stereotyped version of future reality, their prejudiced image of the Negro or Jew. . . .

The most obvious disadvantage of asking for prior public consent before going ahead is the almost certain mobilization and crystallization of hostile sentiment against the innovation. The more vociferous, aggressive prejudiced person has time to make himself heard and to express his opposition in no uncertain terms. . . .

The fact that the sponsors of the proposed action ask for his opinion indicates to him as to everyone else that they are in doubt as to the advisability of the innovation. Given advance notice of the intended action, he has time to get together with other like-minded individuals and to organize for protest or violence. . . .

A simple announcement—Announcing a proposed interracial housing project lends itself to some of the same dangers as asking for public consent. The difference is that the mere announcement without asking for public opinion indicates a feeling of strength. The authority here appears determined, has made up its mind. . . .

Fait accompli—Wherever possible, it is usually best to go ahead without public announcement and discussion, to confront the public with a *fait accompli*. In this manner the change may be introduced without getting much attention, and thus avoid the crystallization of hostile sentiment.

A study illustrating the effectiveness of this method analyzed the reactions of customers in New York department stores to the hiring of Negro sales personnel, was able to demonstrate that the existence of prejudiced feelings does not necessarily lead to discriminatory action. Partly because of the New York state law against discrimination, nine of the fifteen major metropolitan department stores had begun to hire Negro salesgirls by 1947. If prejudice was going to determine the reaction of their customers, it was reasonable to assume that the more bigoted person would refrain from dealing with Negro clerks. He might even change to stores employing only white clerks. To test this hypothesis, trained interviewers were stationed near sales counters where white and Negro girls sold side by side. This made it possible to distinguish customers who dealt with Negro clerks from those dealing with neighboring white girls. All customers thus observed were later interviewed to discover their attitudes toward the Negro personnel. The fact that they were not being

told that they had previously been observed made it possible to compare their attitudes and behavior.

Many customers did not hesitate to voice their prejudice. One out of five New Yorkers interviewed expressed disapproval of the employment of Negro clerks. Some of these stated that they would not buy in stores which hired them. Another 20 per cent gave limited approval. Negro salesgirls were all right, but they would not like to see them selling in departments handling food or clothing. At first glance the fears of management seem justified and it is easy to imagine what would have happened if these figures had been known to management before they began hiring the colored girls.

Actually there was no relationship between what people said and what they did. There were as many prejudiced customers among those dealing with Negroes as there were among those dealing with white clerks. In both groups 38 per cent either disapproved of Negro clerks or wanted them excluded from certain departments of the stores. Not only did we fail to find any relationship between prejudiced attitudes and discriminatory behavior, we even observed some women buying from Negro clerks who told our interviewers half an hour later that they would not buy from Negroes under any circumstances.

—*From* The Social Psychology of Prejudice, *by Gerhart Saenger. Harper & Brothers, 1953. Used by permission.*

•

The research of the social scientists seems to confirm the experiences of many Christian pastors in integrated churches. Kenneth B. Clark a psychologist, points out that "examples of successful desegregation (in education) revealed that desired changes in the behavior of individuals and groups can be brought about directly by changes in the social situation in which they . . . function. The belief that attitudinal changes must precede behavioral changes is not supported by these data" (Kenneth B. Clark in *The Journal of Negro Education,* summer, 1954, p. 347).

Another social scientist puts it a different way: "Action is more self-committing than words." A pastor, still a different way: "The best way I know to change the prejudiced attitudes of the average person is to involve him willy-nilly in fellowship across racial lines. Since race prejudice is rooted in the emotions rather than in the intellect, rational arguments against it are futile. But few people, even the most prejudiced, can fail to grow and change when they share the deep experience of worship and friendship in the church with persons of another race."

This means that it is not only unnecessary but probably unwise for church leaders to say, "We have to get the people 'with us' before we can act on this." Very few people can be talked out of, or even talk themselves out of, prejudice. Practically all the integrated churches became so as a result of action by leaders who created situations in which cross-racial fellowship began the change in attitudes that nearly always follows.—*From* SOCIAL PROGRESS, *January, 1955.*

Pity the Poor Judges!

Imagine an international beauty contest, held in the familiar setting of the Boardwalk in Atlantic City. Its purpose is to select the most beautiful girl in the world, who, in keeping with the restraint characteristic of such occasions, will doubtless be designated "Miss Universe." It is a thoroughly comprehensive affair, and contestants are present from every remote corner of the globe. Here comes the procession!

First in line is Miss Alor, a dusky maiden from an inconspicuous South Sea Island, displaying two rows of teeth carefully blackened and filed down to points. Next is Miss Botocudo from South America, with a huge disc of wood inserted in her lower lip. Behind her comes Miss Manganya who wears her plug in her upper lip. Following in line is Miss China, a slender slant-eyed miss who, being modern, is not kept from walking by having her feet reduced by binding to a mangled mass of bone and tissue as would have been the case with her mother. Then a couple of other Far Easterners, Miss Siam with her long fingernails protected by silver cases, and Miss Burma whose neck is so elongated by a series of brass rings that if she were to take them off she could not hold her head up. Then a group of dark-skinned girls hardly distinguishable except for the carefully worked out patterns of artificial scars on their cheeks, foreheads, and other parts of their bodies. Just behind them is Miss Bushman, a tiny maiden with an extraordinary development of the buttocks, recognized by the more scientific of the observers as steatopygia. Finally comes Miss United States, one of the few blondes on parade, her fair hair artificially curled according to the latest pattern of the beauty parlors, her eyebrows darkened and plucked to a sharply arched pencil line, her lips painted until they resemble overripe beefsteak . . . the tips of her fingers looking like bloody claws, toenails of the same hue peeking out from high-heeled shoes, which not only give their wearer an awkward, mincing gait but also throw her whole skeleton out of kilter with variegated unhappy consequences—but beautiful, oh! so beautiful, in the eyes of her admiring fans in the audience.

Pity the poor judges! An international board, of course, each member of which desires to be fair, unprejudiced, and open-minded. But how can he vote? For to each of them there is only one really beautiful girl in the whole array—his own particular countrymiss. He does not stop to discriminate as to which of the obvious traits are racial and which nationalital. To him they are merged into one entrancing composite of rightness and pulchritude. Nobody argues about these things, nobody tries to prove that they are right, and if an occasional moralist undertakes to convince people that they are wrong, he is nothing but a voice crying in the wilderness.

—*From* Race and Nationality, *by Henry Pratt Fairchild. Copyright, 1947, The Ronald Press Company. Used by permission.*

LEGISLATION . .

One Approach

"You can't legislate morals." No right-thinking person expects to. But sometimes amazing changes take place in attitudes as well as behavior.

NO LAW should require men to change their attitudes, but most laws require something that is contrary to the attitudes of some group of men, whether large or small. No law should punish men for their beliefs or attempt to suppress these beliefs, but many laws are necessary or desirable that require behavior contrary to what some men approve or believe to be the right course. The whole sphere of opinion must be held inviolate by law, if the primary condition of democracy is to be fulfilled. But it does not follow that the behavior prompted by opinion or belief should not be regulated for the public good. The distinction is elementary. In a democracy we do not punish a man because he is opposed to income taxes, or to free school education, or to vaccination, or to minimum wages, but the laws of a democracy insist that he obey the laws that make provisions for these things.

On the same principle there should be no laws against ethnic or racial prejudice. A man should never be subject to legal penalties because he is anti any thing, anti any group, anti any faith, anti any form of government. If he is foolish enough to detest any people as such or to think he belongs to the master race, and if we cannot teach him the foolishness of his folly, then let him stew in it, so long as he does not seek to injure in overt ways those against whom his prejudice is directed. We may not let our "righteousness" interfere with the liberty of any opinion, for that is the beginning of the road to totalitarianism itself. Righteous indignation can be the most insidious enemy of democracy.

So let him think what he will, and if besides he refuses to associate socially with the groups he regards as his inferiors, let him narrow the boundaries of his world and make his folly the limit of his experience. In his private relationships he can discriminate as he pleases. But when

he runs a factory or a hotel it is different, for now his activity is invested with a public interest. In his business he cannot treat his employees as he pleases. He cannot pay them what wages he pleases or work them as many hours as he pleases or under what conditions he pleases. The same considerations of public welfare can properly limit his right to discriminate as he pleases when hiring his employees, to reject members of groups against which he is prejudiced, if he rejects them not on grounds of qualification but instead to gratify his bias. Here too important considerations of public welfare are involved—and they reach up to the very highest interests of the state, for precisely this kind of discrimination, especially against the members of the "colored" peoples, is a major factor in defeating the world influence and the world leadership that this country is now called upon to assume.

—*By Robert M. Maclver, in* Equality by Statute, *by Morroe Berger. Columbia University Press, 1952. Used by permission.*

Hesitation Means Defeat

Precisely because neither doubt nor scrutiny are among the tools the prejudiced have learned to use, it is important that we also call into the battle against them the powerful weapon of the law. . . .

But the effectiveness of any law depends upon the respect people have for it, and this applies particularly to legislation intended to control the behavior of the highly prejudiced. These must not only be laws that most people want but they must also be advocated and forthrightly supported by the "very best" people. They must be laws that are clear and unrelenting in their purpose and firm in their provisions for enforcement. Above all, they must be applied with vigorous consistency. . . .

Prior to the decision declaring segregation in the public schools unconstitutional, a wealth of data was brought together for the consideration of members of the United States Supreme Court. Lawyers, political and social scientists, educators, community leaders, administrators of sundry institutions, all contributed to the record miscellaneous community experiences with desegregation during the last dozen years or so. These occurred in the armed forces, in schools and universities, in churches, in places of recreation, and in public and private facilities of every sort. Some of these undertakings were the result of state or local legislation, some had come about through administrative order or town ordinance, and some were merely attempts to carry out predominant community sentiment.

Some of these decisions to do away with segregation had been introduced gradually, others quite suddenly. Some were undertaken with determination, carried forward with enthusiasm, and administered with confidence. Some were conceived in anxiety, born in fear, and administered with an uncertainty that reflected both emotions. Many of these efforts met with intense opposition; some were impeded by outbreaks of violence and almost all were threatened with such outbreaks.

Some of the efforts were quite successful and some were dismal failures. The successes hardly ever

happened overnight. On the other hand, many of the failures came about because of the decision to impose the order gradually, and from the outset, therefore, there had been partial and usually uncertain enforcement. With each day of wavering administration the opposition grew bolder and more brazen until at last it had succeeded in wrecking the entire undertaking.

None of the successes was accomplished without the most careful preparation, which included a variety of efforts designed to create a "climate of acceptance" in the community itself. The preparation, however, also included a realistic appraisal of the strength and the character of the resistance that might be expected.

On the other hand, many of the failures came about because well-intentioned but ill-informed community leaders had insisted that all opposition "must be won over *first*," and accordingly "educational forums" and "discussion programs" were diligently arranged. These, however, were systematically taken over by an opposition incapable of hearing reasoned arguments but exceedingly skillful at presenting and gaining support for irrational ones.

The successful efforts were those that had early reduced to a whisper the voices of their most intense, highly prejudiced opposition. This they did not by the weight of their arguments, but by the number and strength of those who made them. In each instance the most irate opposition retreated not because they realized the possibility of error in their position, but only when they sensed the futility of trying to maintain it in the face of so determined a group. Then, when the hated decree finally became law, those who had initially opposed it were often among the ones most respectful of it—not, of course, of the principles upon which it rested, but of the power and strength behind it.

The influence of legislation prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, creed, or color is more far-reaching than at first glance it might appear. For it has opened up many opportunities to those who otherwise would have been denied them and without which minorities would have small chance of escaping from their submerged or restricted position.

—From The Fears Men Live By, *by Selma Hirsh. Harper & Brothers, 1955. Used by permission.*

Created by Law—Vulnerable to Law

David L. Cohn wrote in the *Atlantic Monthly* of January, 1944, "It is William Graham Sumner's dictum that you cannot change the mores of a people by law, and since the social segregation of the races is the most deep-seated and pervasive of the Southern mores, it is evident that he who attempts to change it by law runs risks of incalculable gravity." . . .

There was a curious contradiction or inconsistency implicit in the theory of this school in so far as it was applied to the history of race relations in the South. . . .

And yet Southerners cited these authorities upon the utter futility of legislation in the alteration of relations between races to justify and support an elaborate program of legislation to change the relations be-

tween races in a different direction. The inference would seem to be that while sound scientific theory proved that folkways and mores could not be changed for some purposes, it proved at the same time that they could be changed for other purposes.

At any rate, the findings of the present investigation tend to bear out the testimony of Negroes from various parts of the South, as reported by the Swedish writer Gunnar Myrdal, to the effect that "the Jim Crow statutes were effective means of tightening and freezing—*in many cases instigating*—segregation and discrimination." The evidence has indicated that under conditions prevailing in the earlier part of the period reviewed the Negro could and did do many things in the South that in the latter part of the period, under different conditions, he was prevented from doing.

We have seen that in the 'seventies, 'eighties, and 'nineties the Negroes voted in large numbers. White leaders of opposing parties encouraged them to vote and earnestly solicited their votes. Qualified and acknowledged leaders of Southern white opinion were on record as saying that it was proper, inevitable, and desirable that they should vote. Yet after the disfranchisement measures were passed around 1900 the Negroes ceased to vote. And at that time qualified and acknowledged leaders of white opinion said that it was unthinkable that they should ever be permitted to vote. In the earlier decades Negroes still took an active, if modest, part in public life. They held offices, served on the jury, the bench, and were represented in local councils, state legislatures, and the national Congress. Later on these things were simply not so, and the last of the Negroes disappeared from these forums.

It has also been seen that their presence on trains upon equal terms with white men was once regarded as normal, acceptable, and unobjectionable. Whether railways qualify as folkways or stateways, black man and white man once rode them together and without a partition between them. Later on the stateways apparently changed the folkways—or at any rate the railways—for the partitions and Jim Crow cars became universal. And the new seating arrangement came to seem as normal, unchangeable, and inevitable as the old ways. And so it was with the soda fountains, eating places, bars, waiting rooms, street cars, and circuses. And so it probably was with the parks in Atlanta, and with cemeteries in Mississippi. There must even have been a time in Oklahoma when a colored man could walk into any old telephone booth he took a notion to and pick up the receiver. . . .

The effectiveness of disfranchisement is suggested by a comparison of the number of registered Negro voters in Louisiana in 1896, when there were 130,334, and in 1904, when there were 1,342. Between the two dates the literacy, property, and poll-tax qualifications were adopted. In 1896 Negro registrants were in a majority in twenty-six parishes—by 1900 in none.

—*From* The Strange Career of Jim Crow, *by C. Vann Woodward. Oxford University Press, 1955. Used by permission.*

Control, Not Reform

We may not be able to argue the highly prejudiced out of his feelings, but we can control some of his actions that spring from them. For he will modify his behavior, we now know, not out of consideration for others but to spare himself either criticism or punishment. When we use legislation to prevent acts of discrimination, therefore, we must keep clearly in mind the difference between the purpose of such legislation and what we hope may one day be its effect. For the purpose of the law is to control the disorderly, not to reform them. . . .

In a democracy laws cannot be justified on the grounds that they are for someone's moral or spiritual good; they may turn out to be, but that would be an incidental effect of the law and not its purpose. Its purpose is to protect the many, not to improve the few.

—*From* The Fears Men Live By, *by Selma Hirsh. Harper & Brothers, 1955. Used by permission.*

Indirect Gains

Our conception of the role of law in a multi-group society needs to be revised drastically. Allport, Chein, MacIver, Merton, Myrdal, Saenger, Jahoda, and other social scientists have broadened our understanding of the causes of discrimination and of prejudice. We know, for example, that prejudice will not result in discrimination if the standards of the community or of the smaller groups to which one belongs frown upon such behavior. Conversely, we know that nonprejudiced persons will often conform to discriminatory community patterns because of inertia, the mere desire to conform or local pressure. We are beginning to understand that law tends to make certain conduct unrespectable and thus discourages it. We also realize that changing one's patterns of behavior will in time modify attitudes more effectively than a frontal assault on the attitudes themselves. Integrated public housing, for example, will do more to break down Negro-white feelings of hostility, distrust, and aversion than sermons, Brotherhood weeks, and sessions with one's analyst.

The legislative technique also promises indirect gains. Even the campaign to enact civil rights legislation is beneficial, not only in educating the community about the evils of job bias, but also in causing those who have uncritically accepted stereotypes about the capabilities of minority groups to re-examine their practices. It is also true that the mere existence of such statutes on the books tends to stiffen the resistance of employers when employees, trade unions, or customers press for job and hiring patterns that have now become illegal. The existence of such laws also removes the warning label "Controversial!" from the issue of job discrimination, and school administrators become free to include favorable material on the problem in the school curriculum.

—*From* The Uses of Law in the Struggle for Equality, *by Will Maslow. Used by permission.*

THE HOUSED

Who Are HOMELESS

"A house is not a home"—and, if one is nonwhite, sometimes not even a house. But things can change.

MINORITIES will venture into strange areas only when their hunger for shelter offers them no other choice. The decision is made not as a challenge but with trepidation and in desperation. The Negro presents the most difficult problem because of his numbers and visibility. The volume of Negro migration has been so great, his income so inadequate, and the housing restrictions so intense that he tends to live overcrowded within circumscribed borders. He cannot adequately compete with whites, for the latter are preferred as occupants and better able to pay the going market prices. The Negro usually looks for houses within the ghetto, or for substandard quarters elsewhere, which others will not have.

Since the housing famine, the Negro has sought to satisfy his housing needs in three types of areas:

1. White areas bordering on overcrowded nonwhite areas.
2. Obsolete or run-down areas.
3. Panic areas.

In the first the bulging Negro population, kept from diffusing into other parts of the city, presses upon the adjoining section. Normally, the proximity of Negro dwellings would offer no threat to the adjoining whites. But the Negro's anxiety to hold on to his new job and get a roof over his head may embolden him to eye buildings just over the line. Landlords, sensitive to the intense Negro demand, know they can get the same or higher rentals without making the necessary repairs. The block tends to run down and the sequence may be repeated on the next street.

Obsolete and run-down areas inhabited by whites are the most susceptible candidates for the sequence of desertion, infiltration, and influx by nonwhites. These sections are cheaper and their owners often more anxious to sell. But new developments are not immune. Houses recently built are often so flimsy that

the owners find themselves on the treadmill of everlasting repairs. The underprivileged are often the only ones who will bail them out of their investments.

The panic area suffers desertion the moment one or a few minority members move into it. If the residents would stay put, the section would settle in value and status, but the spiral of rumor and fear takes a heavy toll. Offerings glut the market, vacancies appear, maintenance and upkeep are put off, and blight sets in. Panic areas exist, particularly in cities that have experienced large Negro in-migrations. Availability of alternative housing for the whites speeds the exodus. When shortage sets in, the exodus may be halted and the level of social status steadied.

A practice becoming more common is "blockbusting." Taking advantage of an owner's fear that Negroes may move into an area, a shrewd trader approaches an owner in an all-white block and persuades him to sell. Negroes are then moved into the house. The other owners offer their homes at bargain prices. The trader buys them and when he has acquired a sufficient number at low cost, sells them at mammoth profits to home-hungry Negroes. Oddly, experienced blockbusters interviewed by the writer avoid buying houses in areas where there is no prospect of panic and quick purchases at declining prices.

A responsible realtor can avert a selling panic. An incident several years ago in Schenectady illustrates the point. A Negro professional man answered an owner's advertisement of a house for sale in an upper middle-class neighborhood. News of the sale threw the neighbors into a state of sustained panic, only a few degrees short of hysteria. A woman realtor received no less than a dozen telephone calls from frightened men and women. Some wanted to sell at once; others asked what they should do. "Don't do anything," each caller was advised. "Nothing is going to happen to you or to your property. If you like the neighborhood, stay where you are." The advice was taken. Nobody sold, and today the neighborhood is as sound as ever. There was an initial period of awkwardness when the new owner moved in. The Negro handled himself well. He kept the house and garden in perfect condition, responded cheerfully but casually when neighbors finally began to say, "Good morning," and before long he was swapping plants and vegetables and going to the neighborhood church.

The Youngstown Metropolitan Housing Authority asked the City Planning Commission to change the zone designation on a vacant site to permit construction of a racially integrated public housing project. The neighboring residents had objected that the project would lower real estate values in the surrounding area. Youngstown's mayor then asked the official Fair Employment Practice Committee to survey the facts. After examining the evidence, the Committee concluded:

1. The average Negro tenant takes as good care of his property as other tenants of the same economic status.

2. Racial discrimination and prejudice rather than race is the cause in most instances of Negroes living in substandard housing.

3. Rather than lowering property values, integrated public housing projects have had the effect of increasing the value of adjacent property and stimulating the construction of private homes.

4. There is no one universal effect of Negro occupancy upon property values.

5. There are numerous examples where residences in racially mixed neighborhoods have been sold to both white and Negro purchasers at prevailing market prices or better.

6. Too many homeowners trying to sell their houses at the same time is the primary cause of temporarily lowered property values after Negro entry into an all-white neighborhood.

7. Property values in a neighborhood of racially integrated occupancy can be maintained or increased when there is a sufficient number of buyers who can afford to and desire to buy the homes for sale.

—*From* Forbidden Neighbors, *by Charles Abrams. Harper & Brothers, 1955. Used by permission.*

Integrated Occupancy Works

Two integrated and two segregated housing projects, almost side by side, matched in every particular of physical facilities, environment, tenants, and Negro and white ratios, and differing only in occupancy patterns, had produced two contrasting attitudes.

Researchers found ample proof that segregation was neither beneficial nor neutral, that its results were actually malign. Resentments toward Negroes were sharpened and preference developed for more intensive segregation.

On the other hand, where whites came to know Negroes as next-door neighbors, they also came to share a growing sense of a common humanity, which relaxed whatever tensions they had brought with them and changed prejudice to friendly attitudes. . . .

There was marked contrast, too, in how white residents tended to regard one another. Anticipating rebuke or unfriendliness in the culture at large, the residents of integrated projects drew more closely together and were warm in their neighborhood friendships. Housewives in the segregated projects, on the other hand, appeared from their responses to be more peevish, suspicious, and hostile toward each other. While the researchers would not claim that occupancy pattern is the sole factor determining intergroup relations, they found much to show that it is a crucial factor. . . .

It can be said with assurance that the integrated occupancy pattern works. The relationships between Negroes and whites are positive. There is no evidence of "trouble" over and beyond what is normally to be expected anywhere. On the contrary, there are indications that group cohesiveness and morale are higher in such projects than in the segregated interracial projects. White residents in integrated houses, despite initial forebodings, come to like living in them; many of them show pride in its "democracy."

—*From* Living Without Hate, *by Alfred J. Marrow. Harper & Brothers, 1951. Used by permission.*

THE SCRIPTURES

Speak to Us

"The only infallible rule of faith and practice" cuts through human perversity when men will listen.

JESUS came. He confined his ministry to the chosen people, for that was why he was sent. But he praised the faith of Gentiles, saying he had not found the like in Israel. . . . And after his resurrection, when all authority was his, he commissioned his disciples to preach the gospel to all men everywhere.

It was as they carried out that commission that the disciples confronted the precise problem we confront today. We all believe that the Negro people are precious in God's sight, that Christ died for them, that they may be saved through faith, even as we. And the early Church soon saw, through the vision of Peter and the work of Philip, that God is no respecter of persons: the Ethiopian eunuch, the Samaritans, the Gentiles, could all be saved by faith in Christ. That was agreed and settled by the Council at Jerusalem. But, did that mean they were a part of the Christian fellowship without restraint and discrimination? Did that mean that Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians should eat together? Should they commune together? Should they be members of the same local church?

Paul's Clear Word

This is the major issue in the Letter to the Galatians. This was the dispute between Peter and Paul at Antioch (Gal., ch. 2). This was the problem to which Paul devoted large portions of most of his letters, over which he spent untold labors and agonies, for which he was finally arrested and sent to Rome.

The conclusions Paul reached, under the Holy Spirit, are plain to any who will read them. If you will not admit into full fellowship a man for whom Christ died, if you require in addition that he be circumcised, then you make the cross of Christ of none effect. This is why he was so passionate about this matter. Insistence on the cross plus something else, plus *anything* else, is an insult to the very death and passion of our Lord.

I might remark parenthetically that Paul's enemies were more reasonable than we. They would eat with the Gentile, if he was circumcised, and he could go get himself circumcised. We will hold full fellowship with a Negro Christian if he changes the color of his skin. There is no way he can go and do that.

This struggle led Paul to those great assertions, of which we can only offer a sample here. *Galatians 3:28:* "There is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

Romans 10:12: "For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him."

Colossians 3:11: "There is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all."

And the great second chapter of Ephesians, where Paul declares: "He is our peace"—not here, our peace with God, though he is that, but in this context, our peace across customary lines of segregation. "He is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us."

When Christ died, the curtain of the temple was rent in twain, that curtain which separated men from God. But also the middle wall of partition was torn down, that wall that separates man from man, group from group, within the church of the living God. This matter, brethren, is a part of the sacrificial death of the Lord. . . .

Personal Experience

Fathers and brethren, believe me, it is not that I for some reason was opposed to segregation and have sought texts to support me in that position. I was raised in a segregated society. It was natural to me in South Carolina. As an infant, I imbibed it from my environment and many of you did. In the same unconscious way that I learned to be courteous to ladies, I was taught that the Negro has his place.

It was the Word of God which convicted me. It was the Word of God which persuaded me that our mores are wrong here, that our customs are contrary to God's will.

If you rescind this action, plead the fears that are in our hearts, white and Negro alike. Plead the unreadiness of many of our people, for they are not ready. But do not plead the Bible. I beseech you, do not dishonor the Word of God.

—*By Albert C. Winn, in* The Presbyterian Outlook, *June 27, 1955. A speech before the 95th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S. Used by permission.*

"Since God Is One"

The New Testament is shot through with expressions of the unity and kinship of the various branches of the human family. It amazed his disciples that Jesus spoke to a Samaritan woman, and he used a member of her despised group as the hero of his best-known story. In spite of his sense that he had a mission primarily to the lost sheep of the

house of Israel (Matt. 15:24), he was ready not only to heal the child of a woman belonging to a different race but also to commend the faith of a foreign officer (Luke 7:9). In his actions, even more than in his words, Jesus disregarded barriers of blood and tradition that were rigidly adhered to by most of his compatriots.

The issue came up more explicitly in the early Church—and again national and religious as well as racial differences were involved. At Pentecost Jews "from every nation under heaven" were present and received the gift of the Holy Spirit. Not long after, Peter faced the problem of whether a Gentile should be received into the Christian Church. His prejudices were challenged by a Voice that said, "What God has cleansed, you must not call common" (Acts 10:15). Although it was "unlawful . . . for a Jew to associate with or to visit any one of another nation," he visited the centurion Cornelius and administered baptism both to him and to his friends.

Peter's explanation is significant: "Truly, I perceive that God shows no partiality, but in every nation *any one who fears him and does what is right* is acceptable to him" (Acts 10:34). When called to account by the strict Jewish Christians, he related his experience and gave this defense: "If then God gave the same gift to them as he gave to us when we believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, *who was I that I could withstand God?*" (Acts 11:17).

Thus it was affirmed that not *birth* but *the action of the Holy Spirit* was to be the determining factor and *faith* the sole qualification of membership in the Church of Christ.

A little later the question arose whether the Church was to make any conscious effort to reach the Gentiles, or merely "accept" those who like Cornelius asked to join the fellowship. Again the answer was decisive. When the cautious fathers of the church at Jerusalem heard that the young church at Antioch was actually gathering in Greeks as well as Jews, they sent a one-man committee to investigate. Barnabas, their emissary, happened to be a fair and wise man. When he saw the response this missionary effort was getting, he gave those responsible a "clean bill of health." Moreover, he joined them and enlisted as his associate a former enemy of the Church, Saul of Tarsus, who as Paul the apostle became the most effective missionary of all (Acts 11:19-26).

The question still had to be threshed out whether those who entered the Church from the Gentile world had to become Jews and observe the ritual requirements of Israel. A General Council, or Conference, was held at Jerusalem. Here it was agreed that Gentiles would not need to be circumcised or submit to the Jewish dietary laws; they were charged, however, to avoid immorality (Acts 15:29) and to practice charity (Gal. 2:10). Once again it was recognized that basic spiritual and moral qualities had right of way over accidents of ancestry and culture. And when Paul believed certain Christians including Peter had violated the spirit of the agreement by breaking off table fellowship with Gentiles, he told them bluntly that "they were not straightforward about the truth of the gospel" (Gal.

2:14). To sin against Christian fellowship, in other words, is to pervert the gospel.

It was Paul, too, a pure-blooded Jew of the strictest faction, who most clearly expressed the utter insignificance of the human distinctions which occasion so much of our pride. He plainly taught that man is one.

Man is one in his creation by God. In his sermon at Athens Paul said, "He made from one every nation of men to live on all the face of the earth" (Acts 17:26). This apparently means "from one man" or from one common origin—although the King James translation, "of one blood," corresponds to the known facts of anthropology. The basic similarity of human nature in all groups has been abundantly confirmed by scientific investigation.

Man is one in his sin. In his Letter to the Romans, Paul summarized the spiritual history of the Jews *with* the revealed law and that of the Gentiles *without* it. He concluded that there was no distinction between them, "since all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God" (Rom. 3:22 f.). No race or people has a monopoly of virtue or of vice. None is free from sin. All alike stand in need of salvation.

Man is one in his salvation through Christ. Whatever is true of man's origin and nature, Paul places major stress on the new relationship established by Christ. Christ has not only set up a new standard of brotherhood, but has also given a new power that motivates and makes effective this higher unity: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus. And if you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's offspring, heirs according to promise" (Gal. 3:28 f.). This is the divinely wrought possibility for all. It is the present actuality for Christians. Whatever barriers man has erected, contrary to the intention of God, have been done away in Christ.

Man is one because God is One. The necessity of brotherhood may be argued from many different premises—scientific, psychological, practical. Fellowship between various races and groups corresponds to what we know of human origins. It makes for the most satisfying life for everyone. Indeed it has become virtually impossible to conceive of society's going on unless we learn to practice brotherhood. But there is a *theological* necessity which underlies the others. Paul put his finger on the deepest truth of all, when he reasoned that the unity of God requires the spiritual unity of mankind. "Is God the God of Jews only? Is he not the God of Gentiles also? Yes, of Gentiles also, since God is one" (Rom. 3:29 f.). This has implications far beyond the immediate problem of Jew and Gentile in the first-century Church. It forever prohibits any group from denying to another a recognition of its common humanity as the handiwork of a common Creator, or its right to share fully in the common life.

—*From* The Bible and Our Common Life, *by Huber F. Klemme. The Christian Education Press, 1953. Used by permission.*

Aye,

BUT IT DOES MOVE

There is no cause for satisfaction,
but there is increasing hopefulness,
because things and people do change and
the direction is right.

I WAS glad that I was in a better position to answer questions on race in 1953 than I was when people in India questioned me in 1937. And make no mistake, they wanted proof when I said that we are making progress in this area of human relations.

I was able to tell [them] that in 1937 I could not vote in my native state (South Carolina) nor in my adopted state (Georgia), but that in 1953 Negroes are voting not only in both states but in cities all over the South and in rural areas and small towns in some Southern states. I was able to report that in 1937 Negroes were segregated in interstate travel, but that in 1953 Negroes can ride unsegregated when traveling across state lines, although it is difficult across state lines in Southern states. Negroes now ride daily in coaches unsegregated when traveling from the North into the deep South. I told the people of India in 1937 when I was there that Negroes could eat in dining cars on trains in the South only before or after white passengers had eaten, and that up to a few years ago Negro passengers had to eat behind a despicable curtain, but that now in 1953 the curtain has become a relic of the past and Negroes may eat in dining cars on the railroads without discrimination. I was able to report that in 1937 when I was in India, Negroes worked in the leading department stores in the North only on menial jobs, but that now they are clerks, buyers, assistant managers, and managers, and that Negroes are holding significant jobs in several of the leading industries of the country. In 1937 few hotels in the North accepted Negro patronage. Now I believe most of the hotels in the North have Negro guests.

It was equally easy to report the gains in education and sports. I could tell my Indian reporters that in 1937 there was not one Negro in a Southern white university, but that

in 1953 Negroes are enrolled in certain departments of eleven Southern and border universities: Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Louisiana, Tennessee, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, West Virginia, and Kentucky. In fact, Negroes are enrolled in every tax-supported Southern university except South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi. . . .

When asked what the Christian Church was doing in this area, I could tell them that in national and world gatherings the churches are unsegregated, that every national and world assembly of Christian churches has spoken out against discrimination on the basis of color; also that increasingly Negro and white Christians are worshiping together. In 1937, the U.S. Army was tightly segregated. In 1953 there was integration in every branch of the service. All these changes during the past seventeen years have been made without incident or violence, and yet the timid said it could not be done.

I was not so happy when the people of India asked me how these gains came about. I had to tell them that most of the progress resulted from coercive court action, that Negroes had to sue in the Federal courts in order to get what rightfully belongs to them according to the Constitution of the United States. I wish I could have said to them that these gains came about because the American people believe so strongly in democracy and in the Christian gospel that it was unnecessary to battle for them. I could not tell them that. But I did say that it is wonderful to live in a country where progress can be made through the courts without resort to revolutionary upheavals.

They wanted me to compare South Africa and southern United States. I could not speak from experience about conditions in South Africa. But I made the comparison. In race relations in the United States we are moving forward. They are moving backward in South Africa. There is great hope in the United States. The way is dark in South Africa. In the United States the Federal Constitution is on the Negro's side; whereas in South Africa the central Government is against the Indians and the Negroes. It has been a long time since American churches tried to justify the American race problem on the basis of Scripture and theology. Until recently the churches of South Africa did try to support their exclusive racial policy from Scripture and theology.

—*Benjamin E. Mays, in* Presbyterian Life, *February 6, 1954. Used by permission.*

The People *Were* Ready

The Atlanta (Ga.) *Constitution* in its May 15 issue took note of the results of some recent local elections in its own city and in several North Carolina towns, and concluded proudly that the South is making progress. . . .

The *Constitution*'s gratification was well founded. Dr. Rufus E. Clement, Negro president of Atlanta University, had been elected to the Atlanta School Board. It was the first time since Reconstruction days that a Negro had won a city-wide office. His

white opponent, J. H. Landers, had been the incumbent since 1927. Dr. Clement's majority was an impressive 22,259 to 13,936. An analysis of the vote indicated that he had run ahead of his opponent in forty of Atlanta's fifty-eight precincts, and had carried a majority of the white wards. Total Negro vote was about 9,000; thus something like 13,000 white voters preferred Clement.

Landers, who was one of the first to congratulate the victor on his election, had made no campaign. "I didn't think," he explained, "the people were ready for this."

—*From* Nairo Reporter, *June, 1953. Used by permission.*

How Far the Promised Land?

Galileo, after having been forced to recant publicly his belief that the earth moved, is reported to have whispered to himself, "Aye, but it does move!" . . .

Perhaps one of the most valuable of all the evidences of progress can be seen in the fact that now, as I am finishing this book, something seems to have been left out. It would have been impossible a quarter of a century ago, or, for that matter, a decade ago, to write a book on the status of the American Negro without devoting at least one voluminous chapter to lynching. That such a chapter no longer needs to be included reflects the changing pattern of race relations in the U.S. . . .

There are, unfortunately, other forms of anti-Negro violence that continue and will, unhappily, erupt again until housing segregation is entirely eliminated. Great blots on our record are the riots that have occurred during the past decade in Detroit, Cicero, Trumbull Park Homes in Chicago, and Cleveland; and the bombings in Florida, Texas, Georgia, and Alabama when Negroes moved out of the ghetto into formerly all-white neighborhoods.

But the old patterns of violence have been shattered. Sporadic violence has replaced the sickening succession of lynchings, riots, and organized sadism that had been the rule. The change marks a major transformation in the ancient mores.

A critic might say, in appraising the present situation, that every advance the Negro has made toward full citizenship, and the concomitant advances of the United States toward the practice of the democracy it professes, must be discounted by the phenomenon of McCarthyism, the possibility of hydrogen-bomb warfare, and the past and present economic and political mistakes and failures of American democracy. I would agree instantly and wholeheartedly that the problems of the Negro American cannot be isolated from the larger problem of implementing democracy in America and throughout the world. Yet it remains clear that against a most complex and formidable array of obstacles the American Negro has in the past fifteen years made significant advances in his long and tortuous march toward freedom, and that through these advances the cause of freedom has been advanced.

—*From* How Far the Promised Land? *by Walter White. Viking Press, 1955. By permission.*

Who Should Read Social Progress?

Let us suggest the following persons in every local church:

- minister
- elders
- deacons
- trustees
- Christian education committee members
- social education and action subcommittee members
- church school administrative officers
- church school teachers
- officers of older youth and young adult groups
- officers and leaders of women's organizations
- officers and leaders of the men's council
- persons representing the church in community organizations and agencies

Quantity Rates

Single Issue Orders

Single copy	15 cents
5—10 copies	10 cents each
11—24 copies	8 cents each
25 or more copies	6 cents each

Group Subscriptions (to *one* address)

5—10 yearly subscriptions	80 cents each
11—100 yearly subscriptions	60 cents each

Club Subscriptions (to *separate* addresses)

5—10 yearly subscriptions	90 cents each
11—100 yearly subscriptions	75 cents each

Allow 2 months for new subscriptions

A New SOCIAL PROGRESS *feature*

Each month we will suggest timely topics which can be treated in a variety of ways in your church's regular program—

- pulpit announcements
- items for church bulletins and newsletters
- quickie reports at monthly women's meetings
- discussions with elders and deacons
- Bible study and the church's work with families in the church school

THE ANNOUNCER

As Christians we hold that all forms of racial discrimination and segregation are denials of human worth and are contrary to the will of God.

We call for the launching of "operation desegregation" in our churches and Church-related institutions and in the communities in which our churches work and serve. . . . We must continue to work earnestly for desegregation with respect to

- *local churches, presbyteries, synods; . . .*
- *local church organizations and activities, sessions, church boards, employed staff, and volunteer leadership;*
- *Church-controlled and Church-related hospitals, homes for the aged, children's homes, and other institutions, both as to occupants and staff. . . .*

The General Assembly calls upon the members of our churches

- *to work for desegregation in the businesses, professions, and unions to which they belong, and to urge the passage of fair employment practice laws with enforcement provisions in states in which legislation of this type is not already in effect;*
- *to work for desegregation in housing in their communities, private as well as public housing, and to refrain from entering into arrangements or covenants that tend to encourage segregation;*
- *to encourage and support all measures for facilitating the desegregation of public schools, both as to students and faculties;*
- *to seek the election or appointment of qualified representatives of Negro and other minority groups to public positions.*

—G. A. Pronouncement, May, 1955